

Date: Sun, 23 May 93 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #161
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 23 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 161

Today's Topics:

11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
 FCC regs online
 License Question (2 msgs)
 No-Code Stupidity

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 22 May 1993 17:00:27 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!
jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> In article <C78F5r.MEu@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. T
> >What difference does it make anyway. If an amateur is radiating excess
> >spurious signals, for example, isn't s/he just as guilty.
> Ever make a mistake, Dan?

Steady guys... in my youth, admittedly a L-O-N-G time ago ;^) I
considered a new award: Worked All States, 00 ;^) I was well on the
way, too! Spurs, key clicks from a homebrew Xmitter whose oscillator
was pulled by the load...lots of things...I never meant to break the
rules... My mom nearly wore my butt OUT when one of those showed up!

I was guilty, even though my intent was clean...the conatct wasn't! ;^)

73

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 May 1993 00:29:14 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!think.com!enterpoop.mit.edu!senator-bedfellow.mit.edu!
news.mit.edu!marc@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FCC regs online
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Does anybody have a copy of the FCC Part 97 regulations online? I
have a copy which is missing Subpart E.

Please send me mail, since I only read news irregularly. Thanks!

73, Marc N1NZU

--

Marc Horowitz N1NZU <marc@mit.edu>

617-253-7788

Date: Sat, 22 May 1993 05:32:59 GMT
From: usc!nic.csu.net!eis.CalState.EDU!jherndo@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: License Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

What are the differences between the classes, as far as call signs are
concerned? Are NO-CODERS obvious because of their FCC assigned call sign?
This question is from a non-ham.. but very interested in it. All replies
can be sent via email!

-> John W. Herndon
-> INTERNET: jherndo@eis.calstate.edu

Date: Sun, 23 May 1993 05:58:20 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: License Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:

: What are the differences between the classes, as far as call signs are
: concerned? Are NO-CODERS obvious because of their FCC assigned call sign?
: This question is from a non-ham.. but very interested in it. All replies
: can be sent via email!

The callsigns are, in theory, reflective of license class.

Group D	Novice class	2X3	(eg. kc6uud)
Group C	Tech and General	1X3	(eg. n6vtc)
Group B	Advanced	2X2	(eg. kn6hq)
Group A	Extra	2X2	(eg. ab6re)

Group A was initially 1X2 then 2X1 and is now 2X2 from aa/#aa-ak/#zz when they run out they will start using group B. :
Alaska, Hawaii and possessions have their own series.

Many areas have run out of group C calls. They are now giving out group D calls to most Techs. and Generals. There is no difference between coded and no-code techs. on terms of call signs. The FCC doesn't even keep track of techs. who have passed the 5wpm code. The VEC's keep a copy of the CSCE (Certificate of Successful Completion). The amateur is also required to keep his or her copy of same. I don't think this has changed but it is possible that the FCC is keeping track now. Why do you ask?
Are you thinking about taking the exams?

Hope that answered your question.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102               *
*                    Davis CA 95616                             *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....      *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!              *
*-----*
```

Date: Sat, 22 May 1993 17:56:53 GMT

From: usc!wupost!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!

jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: No-Code Stupidity

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> this thread has not been Technicians complaining
> about the unfair system.
> it has been
> people suggesting that the current licensing requirements may not
> be sensible with respect to CW.
>
> My point is that CW is no longer as important to achieving the goals
> of the Amateur Radio Service as it was when the Amateur Radio Service
> was established.
> I've suggested that alternatives be provided
> to the 13 and 20 WPM tests, such as specialized written exams which
> verify an amateur has developed some skill past the norm.
> I've refuted
> claims that the current CW requirements "keep the riff-raff out".
>
> So, what is so obnoxious about this?

Just the truth, Dana... ;^)

I was first licensed in 1956 (I was a kid, I didn't know ham radio was just old farts with funky basements! ;^) and I have watched and lived through several severe upheavals and changes in the examination process...not ONE of which made the incumbents happy.

And, in the new unhappiness of the incumbent ham population, are sewn the seeds of the screaming, the flaming, the gnashing of teeth and all the severe bull sh*t (tm) that flows when this thread is discussed.

CW, in and of itself, does absolutely NOTHING positive for the hobby:

- it is a horridly ineffective "riff-raff" filter -- see any HF band
- it has kept many good potential hams out
- it has nearly killed the growth of the hobby, until the new entry-level license was added
- it has fogged up many peoples' minds with irrelevant bickering
- it has done more to prompt divisiveness and ill-humor and civil war mentality (and thoughts of "ethnic" cleansing ;^) -- with apologies to people in areas where that is a real life and death concern :=()
- it seems to fuel the silly testosterone-based displays of people who mistakenly think that what one's license class might be is somehow an indication of what kind of human being that person might be
- it has probably lasted far longer, as an examination element, than it should/might have had people really been interested in the good of the hobby and the amateur service
- it has probably led to more anguish, agony, and frustration than any other aspect of the examination process, and with less reason
- it is not generally taught properly anyway, so anyone who masters

Morse and actually can copy at 13 or 20 words per minute has overcome some significant obstacles and has shown extraordinary motivation and perseverance

All that said, I am an extra, I teach Morse the best I know how (and this after trying myself to learn it well enough to copy solid for the FCC...and failing for several attempts)... I also like old fire bottle radios, building stuff, operating mobile, riding a bicycle long distances (how's 3450 miles in 24 days at age 50?) and many other things that probably "certify" me as crazy...

The fact remains. CW ain't relevant to ANYTHING about the examination process, and the rules need review...and NOT simply dropping the requirement for a CW exam. The ENTIRE examination process, including the question pool mechanics, which permit rote memorization, need an overhaul.

Apologies to you, Dana, and the rest of the 'Net for this new mutation, but a true Old Fart has to have protective measures to survive! ;^)

73 ES TNX FER THOT PROVOKING
Jack

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - CompuServe 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #161
